Remarks/Arguments

In the final Office Action dated March 1, 2011, it is noted that claims 1, 3-8, and 11-13 are pending, and that all pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled herein and the remaining claims amended for clarity. Claims 1, 3-8 and 11 remain pending. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. No new matter is entered.

Cited Art

The following references have been cited and applied as prior art in the present Office Action: U.S. Patent 6,208,952 to Goertzel (hereinafter referenced as "*Goertzel*"), and U.S. Patent 5,790,804 to Osborne (hereinafter referenced as "*Osborne*").

Rejection Of Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-13 Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Goertzel in view of Osborne. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. Claims 3-8 depend ultimately from claim 1. Claims 1 and 11 are of different claim types and have different features. However, the following remarks may be applied to the specific interpretation of each claim.

Claim 1 calls in part for:

> upon receipt, transferring a response from said internet server to said first device through said second device over said communication bus; and
>
> sending by the first device an internet application protocol identifier to the second device to identify the internet application protocol to be used between the first device and the internet server for sending and/or receiving data, said application protocol being selected from among a plurality of protocols supported by the second device [Emphasis supplied].

Claim 1 has been amended, for example, to clarify the interactions on the communication bus between the first device and the second device, and between the first device and the internet server.

The combination of references does not teach or suggest at least the above mentioned features of claim 1. As a non-limiting example, an internet application on a first device of a communication bus is able to select the application protocol that the first device is going to use to

request data from an internet server from among a plurality of available protocols supported by the second device (for example an interface device). The combination of references does not suggest such features, as particularly recited in claim 1.

Advantageously, the first device need not support an entire internet protocol stack. As a non-limiting example, on the communication bus, the protocol of the communication bus is used for exchanging messages and building connections – i.e. a request is encapsulated in the transport protocol of the communication bus (see e.g. page 11, line 34 to page 12, line 2 of the PCT publication). While different applications of the same client or of different clients may use different internet application protocols on different connections established with the interface device (and subsequently with internet servers through the interface device).

On page 4 of the present Office Action it is stated that, "Goertzel fails to teach the claimed in the limitation of an Internet server." The Office points to an equivalency with Goertzel's server and an internet server. However, Goertzel only appears to teach communications between a client and a server. Messages are not passed through Goertzel's server to an internet server. Communications are handled **directly** between the client and the server in each instance presented by Goertzel. Thus, Goertzel does not teach, show, or suggest the first and second devices in the present claims together with the internet server.

As recited in claim 1, the first device is sending an internet application protocol identifier to the second device to identify the internet application protocol to be used between the first device and the internet server for sending and/or receiving data, said application protocol being selected from among a plurality of protocols supported by the second device. The client-server in Goertzel does not suggest such features.

It has also been stated on page 4 of the present Office Action that, "Goertzel does not teach that the request by the first device includes a message buffer size allocated to message reception by the first device for connection on the first network." In the present Office Action, it has been stated that Osborne was being added to Goertzel to overcome the latter deficiency in Goertzel's teachings.

Applicant notes that this feature is deleted from claim 1 but remains in claim 11. Applicant further notes that the Office Action simply states claim 11 is the same as claim 1.

However, claim 11 includes the features of an application programmable interface for allowing an internet application of a client device connected to the communication bus to select one of said internet application protocols by specifying an internet protocol identifier, for use between the client device and an internet server. The combination of references fails to teach the application programmable interface as claimed and the Office Action does not address this feature. As such the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Goertzel and Osborne fail to teach, show, or suggest that, " *the request including a message buffer size allocated to message reception by the first device for the connection on the communication bus,"* as defined in claim 11. Since it is already admitted that Goertzel lacks any teaching of this limitation, the focus will be placed on the teachings of Osborne with respect to this limitation.

Contrary to the limitation in claim 11, Osborne appears to teach that the size of the message buffer on the **receiving** side of the request is communicated by the sending device to the receiving device. This is clear from a review of Osborne 16, lines and 59 to 67, where it is stated that:

> *Then, via an alternate connection, perhaps a dedicated operating system connection or an alternate network like a transport control protocol/internet protocol (TCP/IP connection, in step 201* ***the sender contacts the intended receiver and requests a connection be setup with an appropriate endpoint buffer size.*** *The receiver then allocates that size buffer region in its virtual address space, finds or makes a free slot in the endpoint table, and fills it with the buffer base address, and virtual to physical mapping information. The receiver then acknowledges the connection in step 203. In a multicast connection, this procedure is repeated for each sender-receiver pair in the multicast. Messages containing an offset from the base of the endpoint may then be sent over the connection in step 204.* [Emphasis supplied].

As shown in the cited portion of Osborne specification above, Osborne appears to teach that the sending device requests that a connection be established with an appropriate buffer size at the receiving device, the receiving device thereafter allocating the requested size buffer region in its virtual address space (that is, the address space of the receiving device). Given the apparent teaching by Osborne above, one can only conclude that Osborne's teachings are significantly different from the claimed invention herein. The manner in which the present invention, as

claimed, operates is neither similar to nor compatible with nor even remotely suggested by the manner in which Osborne operates. In the claims, the message buffer size communicated by the sending device corresponds to a space allocation in the device that **sends** the request; in Osborne, the buffer size communicated by the sending device corresponds to a space allocation in the device that **receives** the request. In the claims, the buffer size is for the sending device, whereas, in Osborne, the buffer size is for the receiving device. The person skilled in the art reading Osborne and Goertzel would define a method in which a communicated buffer size would correspond to space allocation on the **receiving** side of the communicated request; the person skilled in the art would **not** define a method in which a communicated buffer size would correspond to a space allocation on the **sending** side of the request, as claimed. For these reasons, Osborne even when combined with Goertzel does not teach, suggest, or show at least the above mentioned features as recited in claim 11.

In light of the remarks above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 11 and the claims dependent thereon would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art upon a reading of Goertzel and Osborne, either separately or combination. Therefore it is submitted that claims 1, 3-8, and 11 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Guillaume Bichot

/Paul P. Kiel/
Date: 1/19/12 By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312